UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

American Atomism

By H. R. MUSSEY

Ambassador Page, Senator Lodge and President Wilson

By EDWIN D. MEAD

Thoughts of Tolstoy

PART IX

His Country

By M. B. DAIN

VOLUME CVI NUMBER 18

Chicago, January 12, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA NAGELEY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
DAVID STARR JORDAN
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
WALTER WALSH
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
ITALY—DOROTHY WALTON
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 275
American Atomism—H. R. MUSSEY 277
Jottings—J. H. H. 279

ARTICLES—

Ambassador Page, Senator Lodge and President Wilson—EDWIN D. MEAD 279
Thoughts of Tolstoy—Part IX 283
His Country—M. B. DAIN 284
A Christmas Gift to Gandhi—J. H. H. 285

POETRY—

The Revolution Comes—ROBERT WHITAKER 275
Unemployment—RICHARD X. EVANS 278
Fireweed—HARRY ELMORE HURD 287

THE STUDY TABLE—

Religious Book Notes—CURTIS W. REESE 286

CORRESPONDENCE—

Steps Toward Employment Stability—F. S. KINDER 287
Temperance Seals—MARY LEWIS REED 287
A Cheer!—W. P. CALKINS 287

THE FIELD—

The Indian Round Table Conference 274
William H. Taft on American Prohibition 288

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Indian Round Table Conference

On the surface, one might say that the Round Table Conference in London, embodied the sane, civilized way to solve the problem of Great Britain's relationship with India, its greatest dependency. Face-to-face conference. But upon inspection it appears that the delegations on both sides were hand-picked; the dice loaded before the throw. The people who are crying for independence in India are for all practical purposes not represented at all; those entitled to represent them are mostly in jail—in India. At that, there has been far more disclosure of united Indian sentiment, right there in the conference, than anybody would have expected.

But even were the conference to agree upon any real measure of freedom for the people of India, Great Britain would not, could not, put it through; because her own inertia on the subject of India amounts to stupefaction. It looks as if India, so far as continued British control is concerned, must go the way of Ireland and the American colonies. . . .

As for the conventional promise that India may be given a measure of autonomy some day, "when the people are fit for it," . . . Well, in 1769 a pamphlet probably written by Grenville, the British prime minister (though attributed to his subordinate, William Knox), denounced the American colonists as "deluded knaves or fools;" in the same year George Canning, father of the later premier who concurred in the Monroe Doctrine, scoffed at the idea that the Americans had any rights whatsoever; but Sir John Dalrymple, in 1775 on the eve of the Declaration of Independence, was willing to concede the possibility of home rule and self-taxation—"when the colonies should have shown themselves capable of self-government."

This, however, is not the point just now. For upward of a century India has been one of Great Britain's principal meal-tickets, market for her exports. Something has frozen it against her. Look at what has happened to Great Britain's percentage of the world export trade as quoted in *The London Economist* from League of Nations figures:

1913	1924	1925	1927	1928
13.94	13.01	12.16	11.36	11.20

And still dropping. It is quite superfluous for Englishmen to protest that they have no malice against the people of India—why should they? As well might a man disclaim malice against his right leg. The thing is the other way about. The question is, to whose folly is it due that Great Britain's greatest single body of customers has come to entertain malice against herself? Not alone the present-day British; their behavior has been considerably better than that of their

(*Continued on Page* 288)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVI MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1931 NUMBER 18

THE REVOLUTION COMES!

The Revolution comes! beyond the boasting
That only yesterday filled all the air,
Parade of priests and kings, the lordly toasting
Of conquerors and spoilers everywhere
The workers of the world deliverance declare.

The Revolution comes! despite the rallies
Of the proud plunderbunds on every hand,
Though for an hour the Great Transference dallies,
The Revolution comes! in every land
The workers of the world their own demand!

The Revolution comes! O hearts that weary,
And eyes that weaken, straining toward the day,
Fail not! the morning comes, however dreary
However burdensome the long delay;
The workers of the world are on the way!

ROBERT WHITAKER

The following dead of 1930, passed away after our list of dead was prepared for the December 29th issue of this paper. England witnessed the regretted death of LORD MELCHETT, formerly Sir Alfred Mond, great industrialist, and champion of Zionism. The passing of FRANK L. GREENE, United States Senator from Vermont, followed a long period of disability and leaves unchanged the party alignment in the upper house of Congress. The late ALBERT E. PILLSBURY, of Massachusetts, was a distinguished lawyer of that state, for three years Attorney-General, and for many years active and influential politically. Journalism mourned the death in England of SIR HARRY ROBINSON, a noted newspaper correspondent who was at the front during the entire period of the Great War; also, in America, for "KIN" HUBBARD, inimitable creator of "Abe" Martin, who perpetuated into our day the Hoosier school of humor, and of DAVID MOSESSOHN, editor of the JEWISH TRIBUNE in New York, and a distinguished leader in the world of Israel. The death of CHARLES K. HARRIS brought back memories of popular songs of the old days, notably his "After the Ball," one of the most famous songs ever published in this country. Thus does time pass, and custom change!

We spoke last week in this place of the woeful lack of leaders in this critical period of history. Coincident with this, it seems to us, is a lack of public conscience, public indignation, even public interest, in matters pertaining to the very life of the people and even to the survival of civilization itself. What can be more obvious in this day of industrial distress, threatening war, and general social disintegration, than the apathy of the masses? In New York City, to take a concrete instance, there is an indifference in the face of political scandal and civic indecency which is itself a scandal and indecency of the first order. Or look at the nation at large! Millions of men and women out of work, hundreds of thousands starving and homeless, scores of banks failing and involving their depositors in huge losses, racketeering preying upon the land like a storm of locusts—and nobody cares, nor, beyond a futile gesturing in the last election, nobody attempts to do a thing. Europe shows the same psychological and ethical phenomenon. War is pressing upon every frontier, armaments are piling up higher and higher in every nation, huge taxes are devouring the substance of peoples already poverty-stricken and bankrupt—yet apathy is the only prevailing state of mind. Have the multitudes become too cynical to be indignant, or are they too tired to get excited, or are they too discouraged to care any more about anything? Or perhaps, in this country, are they still too well-satisfied and complacent, even amid their multiplying distresses, to feel any sense of outrage against what they are called upon to suffer? If so, there is little hope for the future of our western world. For when people can no longer recognize wrong, or rebel against misery and oppression and folly, their day is done. If so, again, the future belongs to Russia where great leaders are disciplining an aroused and dedicated people to the task of building a great new world, and to India where the saintly Gandhi and the heroic Nehru are showing the way through suffering to liberty for millions who seek a new day for themselves and for mankind.

The talk of a third party, a liberal party, prompted by John Dewey's letter to Senator Norris and all the resulting discussion, has of course come to nothing. As we have profound respect for Professor Dewey, we must believe that he knew all along that his endeavors must be fruitless at this time. Senator Borah is right—third parties are not born in this way or at such times as these. There must be some great

and dominating issue around which such a new partisan organization can form; but what issue even exists today which would not divide a third party as effectually as the Republican and Democratic Parties are now divided. There is unity in no existing political organizations—even the Socialists are so rent and torn by Prohibition that they dare not even mention it in their campaign platforms. Imagine liberals such as comprise the League of Independent Political Action agreeing upon anything that really holds the attention of the American people at this hour! Mention Prohibition in the counsels of the League, for example, and there is nothing left except the pieces strewn about as by the explosion of a bomb. This is an age of hopeless confusion and sterile uncertainty. There is nothing to do politically but stick by the old parties, as the progressive senators of the Norris and Borah type are wisely doing, or else adhere to a thoroughgoing radical party of protest and revolt such as Socialism or Communism. The third-party liberals are going nowhere. They have intelligence but no understanding, courage but no consistency, a wish-phantasy but no real vision—and the times are all against them. They are helpful, as all discontent is helpful. But one wishes that they would come in when it rains, or else raise a stout umbrella.

It would be a frightful thing if Germany should withdraw from the League of Nations, repudiate the Treaty of Versailles, and begin building armaments to match those of France and Poland. A frightful thing from the standpoint of the peace of the world! Yet if Germany should do this thing, it would be an assertion of dignity and self-respect on the part of a persecuted nation which would stir our instant enthusiasm. Our feeling in the matter goes 'way back to the enactment of the Versailles Treaty in 1919, and our conviction that the German delegates at that time should never have signed a document which was an infamous betrayal of the German people inasmuch as it was a flagrant repudiation of the promises pledged in the Armistice. Since that time the business of betrayal has gone right on, as witness the disarming of Germany and the refusal of the Allied powers to begin themselves to disarm step by step down to the German standard as the ultimate goal. This disarmament agreement was as solemn a pledge as anything contained in the original Armistice, and as little attention has been paid to the former as was paid to the latter. Eleven years have passed since Versailles, and the Allied nations are more terribly and expensively armed than ever. What wonder that Germany is disappointed, disgusted, outraged! We wish that she had the wisdom to see that, disarmed as she is, she is the most fortunate of nations. But political psychology, at least in the West, does not work that way. Germany believes that she is a party to a contract, which the other party is systematically refusing to honor. What wonder that she threatens to withdraw! Such action, as we have said, would cast the world into chaos and make certain the next war. But the blame for such catastrophe would rest not upon Germany but upon the nations which have betrayed her.

The movement in New York for the repeal or modification of the Baumes laws is one of the most important in this country today. These laws are wholly bad except in the one particular that they have furnished a fresh demonstration, sorely needed apparently by a generation which knows nothing about human history, that severity of punishment is not a deterrent of crime. This truth has been proved a thousand times in the experience of the race, and now the Baumes laws of New York have added the one thousand and first proof. No more severe legislation for the punishment of criminals has been enacted in our time than is embodied in these notorious laws. A conspicuous example of what we mean is provided by the specific law that a person convicted of a felony for the fourth time shall be given a sentence of life imprisonment. Within a few months after the passage of the Baumes laws, the New York prisons began to feel the influx of men sentenced to long terms for slight offenses, and of those doomed to life imprisonment because of a fourth felony which perhaps in itself was of no great seriousness. Steadily, as time went on, the prison population of the State became crowded with men without hope and with a sense of grievance. The result was a series of explosions, and a succession of prison riots which shocked not only this country but the world. Meanwhile, crime went on as flourishingly as ever. Felonies showed no sign of diminution. Fear of the law stirred defiance far more than it stirred compliance. The Baumes laws, in other words, were from the beginning a complete failure, and now the New York legislature is faced with the task of easing them all along the line, or of getting rid of them altogether. Once again we are taught that punishment never accomplishes anything. Some day we will learn that crime, where it is not a sociological problem, is a psychological problem. Each individual criminal, like each individual invalid, presents his own case to be treated on its own merits.

Americans are rated as a literate people. But *are* they? The *Christian Century* has recently announced a series of special articles by forty-eight supposedly well-known men. A clergyman took the list of names of these men and showed it to eight men in his parish of typical education and influence in the community. One of these men had never heard of H. G. Wells.

Others had never heard of Bishop McConnell, Sherwood Eddy, Stanley Jones, Rufus Jones, Kagawa of Japan, and several others equally distinguished. No one of the eight had ever heard of thirty-two of the trumpeted contributors. It is to minds thus furnished and equipped that the clergymen of the country are preaching. And congregations complain that sermons are dull! Is it sermons that are dull or listeners who are too ignorant to find them interesting? Still more significant is an article in the current issue of *Scribner's* by Thomas Beer, who submits the results of a questionnaire given to a group of young college men and women last summer. The questionnaire contained forty question, of which the following are samples: "Who is George Santayana?" "What is the normal period of gestation in a human being?" "Who were the Piccolomini?" "Who is President of France?" "List three compositions of Brahms?" "Name three living American architects," "Who invented the phrase 'Categorical Imperative?'" These questions were given to twenty-four of these college men and women. The largest number of correct answers to the forty questions was seven. On several questions there was only one correct answer. Only six knew who James G. Blaine was.

> The ten worst papers were by the middle westerners, (reports Mr. Beer). In most cases the spelling was simply chaos, although all participants were either college graduates or were going to college. The girls all fell down on the musical questions completely. These young people do not actually read anything. Not only do they not actually read anything, but their information, as far as I can see, is all acquired by word of mouth. Someone mentions something, a book or a play. They ask about it, talk of it to someone else for the sake of an effect and then forget about it. At bottom, they do not really want to know anything.

These are our "educated" young men and women. These are the citizens who are going to raise children and run our government tomorrow. Literacy? —what is literacy?

American Atomism

Current discussion of unemployment relief brings out clearly the completely atomistic character of ordinary American thinking and the inveterate American dependence on hasty voluntary action as against organized public activity. It has become plain to the most blind of observers that the individual worker is not responsible for unemployment and can no longer be left by himself to suffer from its results. In this situation European countries have turned generally to some form of compulsory unemployment insurance, state controlled. But even under stress of the present crisis we do not yet see any effective movement in that direction here. Public interest in the matter centers largely on immediate schemes of relief, financed by private gifts; and we display a singular complacence in face of the need for such charitable gifts, and a rare ability to call an unpleasant thing by pleasant names. As an example, on the recent occasion of the completing of the widely-heralded $8,000,000 unemployment relief drive in New York City, the mayor blandly informed the committee that they had largely "solved the problem" for the city, forgetting that at best they had provided no more than a ten-weeks' pittance of fifteen dollars a week for those families known by actual police count to be in destitution because of unemployment, and forgetting that the committee did not have for its task at all the doing of anything about the real problem of unemployment itself. On the same occasion Owen D. Young declared that the work was not charity, but justice to the unemployed—to which the reply might fairly be made that it is charity and is not justice, unless in a society that constantly breeds millionaires it represents justice to pay an unemployed man $15 a week in order to keep his family from starving.

We even grow unctuous in our satisfaction over our atomism. Thus the New York *Times,* in discussing our preference for charity rather than insurance, speaks thus:

> The price that individualism must pay for its freedom of initiative and of making the most of its opportunity is that it must have a care for the "collectivity." It is better, we in our democracy believe, that this freedom should be continued. But those who enjoy it must accept its obligations, one of which is that they should show that charity which is due their fellow-beings who have met with misfortune. The alternative is a veritable tyranny of the collectivity over the individual, robbing him not only of this opportunity but of his personal obligation.

Translated into terms of reality, this means that we prefer to maintain an economic scheme that in fact keeps a great body of people in poverty and insecurity, and periodically pitches millions of them over the brink into the abyss of destitution, in order that the more unusual and the more wolfish among us may "make the most" of the opportunity to get rich. Then when the ordinary man is shoved into the pit, the rich and well-to-do, out of the abundance that came from making the most of the opportunity, will toss him enough to keep him alive, meanwhile congratulating themselves on the advantages of freedom and approving their own readiness to accept its obligations by showing that charity which is due their fellow-beings who have met misfortune. Fortunately it never occurs to them to ask themselves whether by any chance those fellow-beings are entitled to a thing called justice, and whether justice in our complex modern world may not include a reasonable chance of enjoying, in return for honest work, a secure livelihood, without depending from time to time on the charity of the more unusual and the more wolfish. I do not wish to misrepresent the exponents of our atomism; for I realize that this is not what they think of when they praise that policy;

but this is what it comes to in practice under the conditions of modern life, what it actually produces in the United States today. By their fruits ye shall know them, in the twentieth as in the first century.

Even in our times of prosperity, is the case so much better with us? I grant without debate that it is better to be fed than hungry, better to be clothed than naked. But aside from this evident good, do we see much that recommends itself to us in the results of our freedom back in the wild prosperous days of 1929? Our whole society, it seemed, from bank president down to office boy, was engaged in a furious and temporarily successful scramble to get something for nothing, a feverish snatching at riches without thought of the moral character of the struggle or its effect on social relations. Few, I believe, are the thoughtful observers who would judge with enthusiasm the character of the life we lived in those days, however great may have been its material comforts. If such, then, is the moral failure of American individualism in times of prosperity, and its economic breakdown now in times of adversity, what is it that recommends the policy to us so strongly that we accept it almost as an article of faith not to be questioned? What makes us ready to sacrifice to it the qualities of character commended in our handbooks of ethics and the forms of social organization necessary to bring some element of security into the lives of the great body of the people?

Partly, I believe, it is the inherited tradition of a pioneer community not far enough behind us to be forgotten; but more largely it is the urge to self-aggrandizement of the more forceful members of our present-day community, who see in the individualistic philosophy greater scope for their overflowing energies, unhampered by the activities of government or the effective restraints of public opinion. It is this latter motive, I believe, that has been responsible for the post-war glorification of the business man and for our current impatience with any restraint on him. The whole nation has found a characteristic spokesman in President Hoover, with his plea for a "rugged individualism."

Now it is time, I believe, to attack this philosophy root and branch as a misfit in our life today. It is not necessary to give up our admiration for the man and the woman of outstanding character and independence. Such were never more needed. But it is full time to realize that character and independence cannot without disaster be developed except in relation to the claims and the needs of those crowding millions with whom our every act today is so intimately inter-related. At a time when the life of the whole world is crying out the necessity, if civilization is to go forward, of finding more effective means of wider and wider cooperation, of learning to adjust the life and the demands of one group of people with another, of discovering means of reconciling differences and learning to live peacefully together in the larger grouping forced on us by our present-day methods of earning a living—at a time like this we cannot turn our faces backward and try to direct our economic, political and social life in accordance with an atomistic philosophy that was indeed possible to a pioneer community, but that spells disaster in the closely integrated existence of the twentieth century United States. It is full time for the preachers and the teachers to take the offensive in this matter, to cry out the virtues of cooperation, the enormous tasks to which it calls us, the superior difficulties as well as opportunities it offers us. The great men in the times just ahead are to be the great individualists, not in our old atomistic sense of that word, but in the sense of realizing the possibilities of individual life lived in close relation and interdependence with other men, because that is the type of life that these times more and more require. The United States needs as rapidly as possible to be brought abreast of that conception. It needs to learn to think in new terms of cooperative greatness. It needs to become conscious of the tremendous fact of mutual interdependence extending not only to all the individual members of our political community but to the various economic communities that cover the whole world. In the face of such facts as we face today we can maintain our old atomistic conception of social relations and responsibilities only at cost of social disaster. We are facing that disaster today in our unemployment situation; as we shall face it again tomorrow in war unless our thinking be changed. We cannot too quickly learn the wide and deep present-day meaning of the words of the Apostle, Ye are members one of another.

H. R. Mussey.

Unemployment

No man has felt the cold that I have felt,
Crouching on raw and rigid knees half dead,
My humid breath not able to thaw hands
Numbed and bleeding from the frost and cold.
I think sometimes my feet are both cut off.
Blindly I wander frozen streets at night
And creep down subway steps with thought of sleep,
Or in the waiting rooms of stations sit
And shiver, teeth chattering, till ordered on;
Then out again, and walk again, where men
Bundled and snug in their warm furs pace by,
Their eyes ablaze with visions of a home,
Food oven-hot to make their stomachs warm,
And woolen blankets on a deep, soft bed.
I shuffle on and wonder how it will be,
And who will know me stretched out in the morgue.

Richard X. Evans

Jottings

Banks do not close any more. Have you noticed that? They are "taken over by the state superintendent of banking in the interest of the depositors." This is, of course, much better than "closing the doors." Yet, your money is gone just the same!

This is the season when everybody, from the presidents of colleges down, joins in a chorus of denunciation of foot-ball. The annual clamor always reminds us of Mark Twain's famous comment on the weather. Everybody complains about it, but nobody does anything!

Speaking of Einstein, it may be well to remind ourselves that, in the light of the Mme. Schwimmer decision, the great German scientist could not become a naturalized citizen of this country if he should decide to live here.

It seems to us ridiculous that Mr. Coolidge cannot disagree with Mr. Hoover on any slighest point of public policy without being hailed as a candidate for the Republican nomination in 1932. Good heavens! Mr. Coolidge has got to say something once in a while in his daily syndicated newspaper article.

John Bassett Moore, greatest American authority on international law, the last man in the world to be called a "red," has come out in favor of the recognition of Soviet Russia. We wonder how long the United States government can stand out against this weighty opinion!

Inflated Reputations.—(4) Andrew W. Mellon, "the greatest secretary of the treasury since Alexander Hamilton," and in whose administration occurred the greatest business panic since 1837.

J. H. H.

Ambassador Page, Senator Lodge and President Wilson

The *World's Work,* in its October issue, commemorates the thirtieth anniversary of its founding and the seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of Walter Hines Page, its founder and long-time editor. It publishes, with words by the present editor, an article of appreciation by Ray Harris and high and deserved tributes by Herbert Hoover and Lord Robert Cecil. I say deserved tributes, for Mr. Page was my friend and I hold his memory in high honor. But although too warm praise cannot be given to his winning personality, his many brilliant powers, and his untiring public spirit, and especially to his devotion to the Herculean tasks which the precipitation of the war so suddenly thrust upon him in London, his political influence there was, in my judgment, by reason of his circumscribed and largely false view of the European situation in 1914, most detrimental to the true interests of the United States, of England and of Europe. The *World's Work's* appreciation lays chief stress upon Mr. Page's service as our ambassador to England during the World War; and in the course of this tribute the writer says:

> Clumsy handling of the diplomatic situation in London, or even an automatic obeying of instructions from the State Department, would in any one of numerous serious occasions have provoked a serious break between Great Britain and the United States.

He speaks of various issues which

> . . . . called forth arrogant and oft-times militant notes from the State Department. Page assumed the responsibility of soft-pedaling and even pocketing some of these communications. It may be said here without exaggeration that Page practically wrote America's part in the war. . . . If America had been isolated from Great Britain, she would never have joined her and her allies in 1917. German offences would have put America in a position of armed neutrality against both combatants.

The picture here revealed, of our representative at London at a most critical period disregarding his instructions from his government, "soft-pedaling" his instructions and sometimes "pocketing" them, at his discretion, on the assumption that his knowledge of the world situation and his conception of our interests and obligations in the crisis were better than those of his government at Washington, and should therefore dictate his policy, is a rather startling phenomenon in diplomatic history. The inference drawn is that his position and his view differed so widely from those of the administration as to change decisively our course in the crisis as concerns England. "Page practically wrote America's part in the war." But for him, the allegation is, we should not in 1917 have entered into alliance with Great Britain in the war, but have remained in a position of neutrality.

This is not the first strong statement of Ambassador Page's cavalier attitude towards his home government and its instructions in the early period of the war. There was a yet more startling revelation of it in a passage in Lord Grey's reminiscences, relating to the time when President Wilson and the State Department were so greatly disturbed over what they felt to be the English violations of international law which vitally affected both Germany and neutral nations. Mr. Page, completely obsessed by the English point of view in the crisis, persistently and openly fought against the effort of our State Department to protect American rights. If the cause of Great Britain called forth protests from Washington which Mr. Page's apologist calls "arrogant" it was because our government felt, and felt deeply, that that course was unwarranted, contrary to international law, and a violation of principles for which the government of the United States had constantly stood. As concerns Mr. Page, Lord Grey wrote:

> Page came to see me at the Foreign Office one day and produced a long dispatch from Washington contesting our claim to act as we were doing in stopping contraband going to neutral ports. "I am instructed," he said, "to read this

dispatch to you." He read and I listened. He then said, "I have now read the dispatch, but I do not agree with it; let us consider how it shall be answered."

This was certainly an amazing diplomatic procedure. The official representative of our government presents to the foreign minister of the English government a protest against a course which deeply concerned and offended us, and assures the minister that he does not agree with his government and suggests their cooperation in framing a rejoinder!

Of course President Wilson knew nothing of the incident. But he knew enough of other things in the same line to warrant his declaration that Page was "more British than the British," and to explain his coolness to Mr. Page on the latter's visit to Washington soon afterwards. The President had proclaimed that we must be strictly neutral, that the assumption that Germany was the one guilty nation was absurd, and that the war had sprung from a multitude of complex causes. He was trying to act with an impartial hand. If Mr. Page did not agree with the position of his government, and could not conscientiously act accordingly, his clear duty was frankly to explain himself to the President and offer his resignation; and it can hardly be doubted that for a considerable period such an offer and the easy opportunity of a change in the London embassy would have been a distinct relief to the President. The contention is well grounded, that Mr. Page's outspoken and well known attitude in London was more responsible than almost anything else for provoking Germany to her submarine warfare, which ultimately drew us into the war. Her government knew well what was going on in London and that we were not carrying an even hand there; and her existence depended upon England's observance of international law as concerned neutrals. The sinking of the *Lusitania* provoked the greatest explosion; but we cannot forget that our own Admiral Sims justified from the naval point of view the torpedoing of the *Lusitania,* loaded so largely, as the Germans knew, and as we now know, with munitions of war. The seamanship on the *Lusitania* which the submarine's commander had the right to expect, and which Admiral Sims so sharply criticized, should have been such as to prevent loss of life; for, he was close to shore.

The efforts of Ambassador Page to thwart President Wilson during the war find a startling counterpart in the efforts of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge in the same direction during the peace negotiations at Paris following the war, as revealed by Allen Nevins in his biography of Henry White, recently published by Harper and Brothers. Mr. White, so conspicuous in American diplomacy for thirty years, was, like Mr. Lansing, the Secretary of State, a member of the American peace commission accompanying President Wilson to Paris. He was a Republican; and before he went he carefully consulted various Republican leaders, including Theodore Roosevelt and Elihu Root. Mr. Roosevelt said that "the peace must be fair to all oppressed peoples, and that above all there must be an international organization to prevent future wars." How earnestly Mr. Root cooperated with President Wilson concerning the covenant of the League of Nations we know. Like Mr. Taft and Mr. Hughes, he sent, at the President's request, many important suggestions for the Covenant; and the suggestions of all three Republican leaders were gratefully accepted and incorporated in the Covenant.

Very different was the conversation which Mr. White had before his departure from Washington with Senator Lodge; and in the hour before Mr. White sailed Mr. Lodge wrote a nine-page memorandum for his guidance. In this memorandum, Mr. Nevins says, Senator Lodge laid "fierce emphasis" upon his leading premise, that it was necessary in every way to cripple Germany. "Nothing would so protect us from war in the future," he said, "as the separation of the German empire into its chief component parts." As to the League of Nations, while the general conception of some organization among the nations as a means of promoting world peace and order must appeal to thoughtful men, the world was not ripe for it as a practical political measure; and under no circumstances must provision for such a league be made a part of the peace treaty which concluded the war with Germany.

Senator Lodge requested Mr. White to show his statement, in strict confidence, to Balfour, Clemenceau and Nitti, representatives of the powers with which we should have to deal at Paris, all of them known to Mr. Lodge personally. He asserted that his statement represented not only the views of the Republican party, but of America in general, certainly of the Senate; and as such he wanted his statement shown to these European statesmen. This knowledge might in certain contingencies be very important to them in strengthening their positions. He believed that Mr. Wilson's ideas misrepresented the United States; and he thus appeared willing to assist the European leaders in impeding and thwarting the President at the Paris conference. This seems almost incredible; and it appears doubly heinous as we remember that Mr. Lodge was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

The spectacle of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee plotting to undermine the reputation and influence of the head of his own government in the negotiations in the most acute crisis in our foreign relations in the last half century is not an edifying one; and this is not the only nor perhaps the worst such intrigue which Mr. Nevins reveals.

It hardly need be said that Mr. White gave no heed to Mr. Lodge's dishonorable proposal. He did not become the medium of its transmission to the European statesmen, but simply "pocketed" the memorandum. But the episode, like the revelation of Mr. Page's disregard of the President's policy and of his instructions at London, shows what President Wilson was up against in his endeavors at that critical time to keep the country true to its best traditions and to the interests of civilization in cooperating with the progressive and bravest sentiment of Europe for the organization of a peaceful and united world.

The point of central significance in this whole mournful chapter is that the theory of the origin and cause of the war upon which Ambassador Page and Senator Lodge acted in their machinations against President Wilson was a theory which has long been discarded by the best thinkers, scholars and statesmen; although it is a theory which still finds occasional sepulchral echoes. A learned American scholar has this year published a work of a thousand pages aiming to demonstrate that a prediction which he made in a lecture in January, 1914, that "Germany was preparing to begin a European war," was fulfiled, and

that the view of the English government when it entered the war in August, 1914, was justified and was the true view. This ponderous product of meticulous erudition is an anachronism. Unfortunately for the belated apologist for the Whitehall of 1914, every one of the three responsible English statesmen of 1914 has long ago explicitly repudiated the view of the European situation upon which England entered the war. Lord Grey, who more than any other controlled and dictated the course of England, and who in his reminiscences of the period has some shaky explanations and defenses of it, finally declares that he had become convinced that neither the German emperor, the German chancellor, nor the foreign minister desired or intended the war, but were all victims of a confused and menacing military situation in Europe which was too much for them. Mr. Asquith, the prime minister in 1914, goes so far in accentuating the essentially accidental occasion of the war as to express the belief that one man, Baron von Bieberstein, Lichnowsky's predecessor as German ambassador at London, could if he had lived, with his great political ability, great diplomatic experience and great influence both in Berlin and London, have prevented the outbreak of the war. Lloyd George, most violent of all as late as the election of 1918, although he had been the slowest and most hesitating in sanctioning England's entrance into the war, doubtless spoke for all when he declared, looking back on the war in cool blood, that he was persuaded that no nation or government had planned or really wanted war, but that all alike had "stumbled and staggered" into it together, through the lack of proper discussion. Happily the Council and Assembly of the League of Nations provide, as President Wilson with such prescience clearly foresaw, the place and opportunity for such discussion in the future. A cardinal virtue and service of the League is the fact that its very existence and activities make the men responsible for the destinies of the nation's associates and friends instead of strangers. But Lloyd George's frank and bald avowal of the central fact in 1914, with ten million fine fellows slain and twice ten million more crippled and wrecked for life as the result of the blunder, is a gruesome foot-note to the history of the period. The world's struggling millions, who have to do the fighting and the dying when wars are once decreed by those "higher up" are sick of such costly "blunders" and are solemnly calling a halt.

The sudden and accidental manner, the lack of deliberation, with which England went into the war finds its most startling revelation in the diary of Lord Morley covering the proceedings of the cabinet during the fortnight preceding the declaration of war, which has been published since his death in both England and America. It is a momentous historical document; and its sincerity and accuracy have never been questioned and never will be. Only Sir Edward Grey, the foreign minister, had a clear position and purpose, and his decision, based chiefly upon his feeling that the Entente must not be weakened, defined and dictated the action of the government. Mr. Asquith was floundering, under his awful responsibility, but would not break with Grey. Lloyd George, at first firm for neutrality, held out to the last, when, provoking satirical but not unkind comment from Lord Morley, he swung over to the rapidly improvised majority. Lord Morley and John Burns resigned.

The common popular appellation for John Morley in the old days, from political friends and foes alike, was "Honest John." John Burns might with equal warrant be called "Honest John." I knew him for many years, always seeing him on our successive visits to England, seeing him indeed in 1914 after his resignation, when however in loyalty to his associates in the cabinet his lips were sealed concerning the war. Going back to Germany from London a month after the outbreak of the war, for first-hand knowledge of the real thought and sentiment in Leipsic and Berlin,—real knowledge was as impossible to get from London papers as it was in Germany to get the truth about things in England,—I took back to Burns, Cologne and Frankfort newspapers containing a long report of an alleged speech by him in London in support of the German contentions. Liars are international, in war-time peculiarly industrious, and in 1914 they were as expert in Germany as in England and America. John Burns' attitude in 1914 is now, of course, fully known; and Lord Morley's tribute to his honor and firmness in the cabinet discussions on the eve of the war is memorable.

Ramsay MacDonald, who stood with Morley and Burns in 1914, was not like them a member of the cabinet; but he was a member of Parliament, and he knew well that in the first election in the war-time he would be dropped, as was of course the case. I have known Mr. MacDonald well for thirty years, from the time when, at the beginning of 1899, the year of the first Hague Conference, he came to Boston to confer with Edward Everett Hale and myself about English and American cooperation in stirring up public sentiment in behalf of the then approaching conference. He was then a young London journalist, and at the moment a lieutenant of William T. Stead, who had just started his little weekly "War Against War," and whose commendation to us MacDonald bore. His devotion to the cause of international justice and friendship has grown ever stronger with the years and with his growing responsibility and power. In August, 1914, I had a long conversation with him in London. He stood firmly with Morley and Burns, presently paid the penalty for his condemnation of the war,—and is now Prime Minister of England. He believed that the then current stress upon the invasion of Belgium as provocation for war was largely fictitious, exaggerated for popular political purposes, and that the government, when France was once in the war, would have gone to her support, Belgium or no Belgium. He believed that England's true service to herself and to Europe lay in neutrality. Few of our people know or remember the powerful appeal of the Neutrality League, so quickly and energetically created in London on the eve of the war and numbering so many men of importance, all of whom probably today view the situation essentially as they did in 1914. The best and most important English work on the origin and causes of the War is that of George P. Gooch; and the views of this accomplished and searching English historian upon the situation in 1914 coincides with the views of Morley and MacDonald.

It was the same Ramsay MacDonald who believed in English neutrality in 1914 who, as the head of the English government, came to America in 1929 to urge our cooperation in cutting down the world's monstrous naval armaments. We had sponsored the Kellogg Pact, and 60 nations had endorsed it, renouncing war as an

instrument of policy and pledging the settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means; and the clear corollary of this was the rapid reduction of the instruments of force. Our President, with the warm acclaim of our people, joined the British Premier in a public declaration that the London naval conference then planned should be based on the Kellogg Pact as its cornerstone. We know what followed. The greatest opportunity of recent time for removing from the peoples the burden and menace of the great naval armaments was thrown away, and thrown away by us. The English Premier in opening the conference declared, in the spirit of his conversations here, England's readiness to do away with the costly big battleships. The other powers would readily have assented; but our delegation blocked the proposal and the battleships, which we need least and whose cost we alone are able to bear, still, little reduced in number, stay on. The conference, with no echo of the great pledge to make the Kellogg Pact its cornerstone, dwindled into weeks of figuring how we could secure "parity" with Britain in the tons and guns of the various classes of her ships. The expectant peace party waited through the months, confident that in the successive crises messages from the President were urging our delegation to remember the great pledges of the manifesto; but when the delegation came home, with its lame and impotent conclusions, to a depressed and disappointed people, its head, the Secretary of State, declared in his public address that no message had come to them. The delegation had been left to itself, with no leadership that distilled "astral spirits," and the signal advance was not made. Mr. MacDonald in his Mansion House speech the other day said in closing, "Great Britain, while perfectly prepared to lead the way, wants to know how the other nations are following, because she cannot allow herself to be isolated in the steps she is taking to secure peace."

So it is always. There is no advance without a great vision, consecration, courage and support. Woodrow Wilsons, prophets of a great new advance and synthesis, come to the front only once in a generation; and then they may be frustrated by diplomats, senators and foreign secretaries unmoved by their ideals and caring mainly for the currents of their own circle and their hour. In a democracy, it is only the vision, consecration and resolution of the aroused plain people that can reliably effect cures and make worthy history. An aroused passionate people can do nothing worthy; and in the long run, as Jefferson so truly said, ignorance and democracy cannot go together. The Balfour government was far saner than the English populace at the time of the Dogger Bank incident; and millions of Englishmen still thought, as many continue to think, of the Germans altogether as "Huns," bound to lord it over Europe and subdue the world, long after their responsible statesmen had publicly declared that the views of the European situation which they held at the entrance into the war were mistaken. I would not make severer strictures upon popular notions in England, where I chanced to be when the war broke out, than on great circles in this country in the days that followed. The fashionable portents upon the horizon were constantly such as only the pusillanimous could fear and only the crazy would credit.

Nor can unthinking and conscienceless parties save us. Woodrow Wilson's party, at its 1924 convention, paid no heed to the impassioned appeal of Newton Baker to revere and respect his policy; and in 1928 it adopted a platform that neither Woodrow Wilson nor Thomas Jefferson could stand upon. There will be no relish of salvation in our party politics until millions of our sober and resolute people unite in recognition of the fact that Jefferson meant what he said and that what he said is now imperative in our national and international life.

As concerns our parity with Britain in her naval strength, there is of course no reason why we should demand or desire it; for there is no parity in exposure, position or problem. The measure of a nation's proper defense is not its presumed prestige, but its danger; and Mr. Hughes has truly said that in no other power or possible combination of powers lies any menace to our security. Parity in security, not in guns and tonnage, is our sole concern as between Britain and ourselves. Our security, with an ocean on each side of us, with no near menacing powers, and with complete capacity to sustain ourselves in any emergency, is absolute; while Britain has troublesome neighbors just across the Channel, has with her Dominions, scattered all over the world, double our coast-line to protect, could not if isolated feed herself for two months, and depends upon open and safe sea-routes for her very life. She might indeed have excuse for not abolishing her battleships; we have none. Yet in this November, 1930, one of the secretaries of the State Department, speaking in New York, declared that we now build ships of war not for offense but only for national safety, only for "self-protection in case madness once again assails the world." At this moment insane admirals, backed by insane newspapers, some of them respectable, are urging that we hasten to build a billion dollars' worth of cruisers to bring our navy up to the highest point formally sanctioned by the London Naval Treaty, a point never practically contemplated by the powers of the Treaty and intrinsically, in view of the Kellogg pact and the international situation, as wicked as it is insane.

Every instructed school boy knows, or ought to know, that this talk is "madness"; and every responsible official at Washington should be brought sharply to book by the country for every such sop to the big navy craze and the big navy junta, which hold America back from her clear and commanding duty. This does not mean that we should not keep the nation in what Washington called "a respectable posture of defense" so long as such postures are necessary; but it does mean that we can best make a change of posture rapidly if we will take the leadership in the matter which is safe and obligatory for us, and that meantime we should not talk of ghastly dangers. As Ambassador Houghton well said in his speech at Washington the other day, "most of the fears of attack which swim about in our national consciousness are mere phantoms; they have no basis in reality." It is of no use harking back to 1914 and 1920 unless it is to get wisdom for the new occasion and new duty of this hour. The crooked courses of Ambassador Page and Senator Lodge, by reason of their obsession about Germany, have their counterpart in the course of the politicians who in 1930 strive against disarmament. For disarmament is the imperative of today, as the creation of the institutions of international law and justice to supplant the instruments of force was the imperative of Woodrow

Wilson. America can never do its duty to the world until it has an administration with the same conviction and resolution concerning the one which he had concerning the other. These are the inter-dependent correlatives; and until we discharge our function as he discharged his, we, the very sponsors of the pact renouncing the policy of war and pledging the methods of peace, stand convicted before the world of gross insincerity and abdication of the leadership which we assumed. Panegyrics upon the Kellogg Pact do not atone for neglect of it.

Mr. Page's panegyrist claims, as his ultimate praise, that but for him and his modification of President Wilson's purposes we might have found ourselves in 1917 in a position of neutrality. Would that have been a supreme disaster, for ourselves or for Europe? Would it have been the worst disaster for England and Europe if John Morley and Ramsay MacDonald had controlled English policy in 1914? The views of the situation which they held have been demonstrated to be true; the theory upon which the government acted has been shown to be mistaken. When did error become a better guide than truth? There are few human occupations so fruitless as the attempt to reconstruct history; but although the war, from the democratic point of view, brought some great salutary changes, did they offset the damage, and would not all have duly come in a sure and better way? Parliamentary government, with the rising disaffection with militarism and the rapid growth of the liberal parties, was surely on its way in Germany; and even Russia, with its new Duma and the drastic lesson of the Japanese war had begun to feel the pressure of the modern spirit. Was not the chief result of our entrance into the war simply its prolongation, with enormous increase in the loss of blood and treasure? Some peace must somehow soon have been patched up; and would not a negotiated peace, a "peace without victory," instead of a dictated peace, have had at least this supreme advantage, that it would have impressed upon both parties alike a deeper sense of the futility of force? The parties were not greatly unequal; indeed the combined armies of Russia and France in 1914 were greater than those of Germany and Austria; and that Germany had no long plans for war was evidenced by the fact that she had no store of munitions, but had to live from hand to mouth like the other powers. The direct consequences of this or that result which impended in some forebodings would probably never have been precipitated, for all knew that there was a tomorrow.

As for ourselves, can it be successfully maintained that the mere census of Germany's offenses and actual damage to our ships and people in the confusion was sufficient to explain and warrant our interference by war at such an hour? Was not the real provocation the theory of the general situation, so sedulously fostered by a hundred men in high place like Mr. Page and Mr. Lodge, finally and decisively permeating the public mind, attributing to the German government and the German people a character, ambitions, purposes and power which they did not and could not possibly possess, and interpreting particular and sometimes inconsiderable events in the light of that demonstrably false assumption? If there is no way of judging the future but by the past, and if we are to avoid such "stumbling and staggering" as that now confessed of 1914, it is highly expedient for us to face our recent past with plain questions and plain answers.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day" here published for the first time in English*]

XXIX

1

Consciousness of the imminence of death teaches men how to bring their tasks to completion. Of all these tasks, there is only one which is always quite complete: the task of loving in the present.

2

Strive so to keep thy life that thou shouldst neither fear death nor desire it.

3

People say: "It's not worth my while, it's time for me to die."

Everything that is not worth while because it is time to die, was never worth while at any time. But there is a task which is always necessary, and the nearer you are to death, the more necessary it becomes: that task is to improve your soul.

4

An animal lives without knowing that its life will end in death, and therefore it does not suffer from the fear of death. For what reason is it given to man to see the end which awaits him, and why does it seem so dreadful to him? What is it that harrows his soul, sometimes to point of driving him to kill himself from the fear of death? I cannot say why this is, but I know to what purpose: that rational man should transfer his life from the life of the body to that of the spirit. This transfer not only does away with the fear of death, but even makes the expectation of death somewhat like the feeling of a wayfarer returning home after a long journey.

5

Death delivers us so easily from all difficulties and calamities, that people who do not believe in immortality should desire death. But those who believe in immortality, who expect a new life, should desire it still more. Why, then, do most people not desire it? Because most people lead the life of the body and not of the spirit.

6

You desire to be freed from sin; and life, by weakening your body and its passions, helps you. Set your life on being freed from sin, and diseases, old age, all bodily misfortunes, even death will be felicity.

You grow older, you become weaker, you die in body; but in spirit you become stronger, you grow, you are born.

7

Do I fear death? No. But at its approach, or at the thought of it, I cannot but feel such excitement as a traveller would experience on approaching the place where his train is to drop down from a tremendous height into the sea, or is to be raised up to a tremendous height on a balloon. A man, when dying,

knows that nothing will happen to him; that it will be the same with him as with millions of other beings; that he will only change his mode of travel; but he cannot help a feeling of excitement when he approaches the place.

XXX

1

We think that life ends in death, because we count the life of the body from birth to death, as life. To think thus of life is like thinking that this pond is not the water in the pond, but its banks; and that, if the water went out of the pond, this water would be destroyed.

2

He who loves good (God) with all his soul, cannot believe that his life ends in death. Love of good (of God) and belief in undying life are one and the same.

3

Death is the destruction of that glass through which I looked at the world. Will this glass be replaced by another? This we cannot know, nor need we know. One thing we truly know: that the destruction of the glass did not destroy the eye.

4

He who sees the meaning of life in spiritual perfection, cannot believe in death, cannot believe that perfection has been broken off. That which is being made perfect only changes its form.

5

Death is the cessation of that consciousness of life which I now feel. Consciousness ceases—I see this in the dying—but what becomes of that which was conscious? This I do not and cannot know. One thing I truly know: that this "something" which was conscious cannot cease.

6

Death and birth are two boundaries. Beyond these boundaries lies the same unknown—unknown to me, but *something* and not *nothing*.

XXXI

1

From birth to death man desires good for himself. And that which he desires is given to him, if he seeks it where it is: in love toward God and men.

2

One man cannot really do good to another. Every man can truly do good only to himself, by living not for the body but for the soul.

3

It is said that he who does good needs no reward. This is true if you think that the reward will be not in yourself and not immediately, but in the future. Man, however, cannot do good without reward, without the good giving joy. The thing is to understand in what true joy consists. True joy is not in the external and the future, but in the inner and the present: in the betterment of our soul. In this is the joy and the reward, and the stimulus to well-doing.

4

Nothing but death ahead, and nothing but the fulfilment of duty at the moment. How joyless this seems! But, nevertheless, place your life in that wherein it really lies: in ever greater and greater union with God and men through love; and that which seemed joyless will become the best, the inviolable felicity.

5

By transferring his life from the bodily sphere to that of the spirit, man cannot only deliver himself from evil, but can transform his whole life into that felicity which nothing can violate.

6

"And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you."

—*John XVI*, 23.

All is given us. Only seek your felicity there, where it is: in the harmony of your soul with the will of God; and you shall have all that you could desire.

And our ills arise only from ourselves, when we fail to do that which is appointed for us.

7

Joy in a life is like oil in a lamp. As soon as the oil grows low, the wick burns down; and burning, ceases to shine, and only gives off foul, black smoke.

A life without joy passes uselessly, spreading about itself nothing but gloom and sorrow. Whereas joy is given men only when, after having overcome sins, temptations and superstitions, they give themselves up to that divine love which lives in their souls.

8

When a man is unhappy, there immediately arise before him a series of the most difficult and insoluble questions: For what purpose do I exist in the world? For what purpose does the world exist? And it seems to him that he cannot live without solving them. But, if he is happy, all the questions fade at once into nothingness, and there is a single answer to all of them: "I thank everything and everyone, and I wish you all the same."

And, therefore, it is clear that man can and should be happy.

[*To be continued*]

His Country

Little Chandra ran into the courtyard breathless. His grandmother stopped the music of her spinning wheel to hear the outburst of his disturbing news. He had seen soldiers marching down the street driving before them a crowd of students. The boys' white caps were torn, their chudders dragging in the dust, and they were shouting "Gandhiki jai," "Mahatma Gandhiki jai." What did they mean by "Victory to Gandhi?" and he ran to her with eyes wide and troubled. "You are too young, little one, to understand," she said, "but the Mahatma has gone to prison; they were perhaps being taken to prison too; many have gone to prison and some have died for the freedom of their country, my son; but come and we will spin and sing that thou may'st forget."

Chandra was a Hindu boy—a Brahmin—only ten years old. His golden brown limbs and dusky cheeks suggested polished bronze, but under the broad brow and almost raven hair his soft brown eyes were full of life and feeling.

His few years thus far had been untroubled. As long as he could remember he had played with his

brothers and sisters in the shaded courtyard, where the fountain sang as the water splashed into the basin, sending cool breezes through the wide open doorways, or with his little sister Kusum he had squatted on the red tiled floor and listened to grandmother chant the songs of India. Grandmother always sang as she ran the spinning wheel. "Thou must sing love into thy work," she said, "and then it will be perfect."

The days passed and often in the dusk of evening, when the family gathered, he sat silent upon the rug among them and listened to many things: how troublous times had come upon his country; that India would never be the same again; it had been a land of prayer and now it had become a land of strife. On the banks of the sacred river, where the people gathered to pray to the dying sun, there was now the noise and whirr of machinery; where the elephant and ox cart had been the burden carriers, was now heard only the honk of the motor car; thus the white brother was killing the soul of India.

But how could they kill the soul? His mother had taught him from the Gita that the soul lives always. And why were men put in prison for loving the Mahatma? Mother said Mahatma Gandhi taught men to hate no one; that every man was his brother. Was not the white man his brother? His elder sister Marachie was sent to the mission school; she said the white guru taught them of a Lord Buddha but he called him the Christ, and the Christ said, "Love your enemies," but how could one love even a brother who beats him and puts him in prison? But Marachie says the Mahatma is in prison and the people killed the Christ. And he pondered all these things in his heart. What were they going to do to his country that it would never be the same again?

He loved his country—a land of golden dawns and flaming sunsets, of hot noonday sun and dewy eve; of vivid tropic flowers and dense mysterious jungles. He had been taken to the sacred Ganges and had watched the hundreds of bathers, their floating garments of orange, violet and crimson like liquid rainbows on the waters. He had seen a procession of stately elephants clad in gold and scarlet, and their more gorgeously apparelled riders swaying with the heavy beasts in their billowy rhythmic motion, and his childish heart had thrilled with an inherited love of beauty.

When he had asked his mother what a little boy could do for his country she had said: "Thou must stay and comfort thy mother, little son," and she bent tenderly over him until her soft silken sari swept his dusky head; "Thou art the only son left, little one." For many days now she had been praying at the family shrine, much longer than was usual, but today—she was not there, nor in the house. Suppose—but he could not suppose! His father wore the white cap too, and his mother—suppose—but no, he could not suppose, he must know.

The court was empty and silent save for the soft splashing of the fountain and the drowsy hum of insects among the flowers. He ran out in the garden and through the garden door to the cobbled street. Yes, he knew the way to the park where the soldiers were garrisoned, but today he needed only to follow the beat, beat of many hurrying feet, all in one direction. He did not feel the hot stones under his bare brown feet, nor the blazing sun overhead.

Soon against the tropical verdure of the great park he could see in bright relief masses of brilliant orange saris, all flaming in the sun, and facing them in unbroken file, an immovable wall of silent patient brown faces, blending into a solid mass of white caps. What was that he heard? Thud, thud, it seemed a thousand thuds, a sickening sound of resounding blows; but the column of white capped figures did not flinch; the only cry he heard was "Gandhiki jai," "Mahatma Gandhiki jai," and then again the sickening thud, thud, and some had fallen. Suppose his father were there to die for his country; they would not strike his mother, no! Slipping through the maze of swaying color he ran forward just as the long staves fell again.

Perhaps they would not willingly have struck so small a soldier of the cross. They carried him with other wounded to a hospital bed. He opened the soft brown eyes to a face bending over him, and his glance took in the four walls shutting him in. He tried to speak, then his eyes closed again. Chandra would never know what they were doing to his country.

M. B. DAIN.

NOTE:—The above was founded upon a true incident that occurred during a demonstration of protest against the imprisonment of Mahatma Gandhi.

A Christmas Gift to Gandhi

There comes to me from abroad a page clipped from an English magazine, *Truth*. The page is taken from the "Christmas Number," precisely dated December 25, 1930.

Three-quarters of this page is occupied by a monstrous cartoon of Mahatma Gandhi, drawn by an artist who inscribes himself Raphael Nelson. Under this picture appears a poem, entitled "To a Great Soul," with no author's name attached. It may be imagined, we suppose, that the verses were written by the artist, Mr. Nelson. Perhaps another author, having some secret sense of shame, was loathe to confess his responsibility for what he had written. In any case, here is the poem:

Great Soul! Who piously dost prate
The common brotherhood of man,
Yet leav'st the outcasts to their fate
Beneath an everlasting ban.

Great Soul! Who turnest up thine eyes
At wicked bloodshed's very name,
Yet sayest all that in thee lies
In order to provoke the same.

Great Soul! Who put'st on saintly airs
While bursting with malignant spite!
What carest thou how India fares,
Great Soul, yet greater hypocrite?

The correspondent who sends us this poem, himself an Indian, writes that "this is the general attitude of the English people toward Gandhi." We find it hard to believe this. Yet we remember that it is recorded of another Great Soul, many years ago in Palestine, that those who stood in fear of him "mocked him"!

J. H. H.

The Study Table

Religious Book Notes

Modern Religion from Puritan Origins, by Henry Hallam Saunderson. The Beacon Press, Boston, Mass.

Mr. Saunderson has sketched the origin and development of Puritan ideas, showing that the Puritan principle is that of the direct relation of man to God, without human intermediaries. He rightly maintains that this marked a distinct gain over hierarchal forms of ecclesiastical life. But what he does not see, or at least does not discuss, is that Puritanism not only left intact but actually strengthened the hierarchal and autocratic *idea* in theology, viz., that individual worth is derived from a super order of worth. Although Calvinism represents this idea at its worst, it is native to the whole Puritan movement. And while Puritanism undoubtedly loosened the chains of ecclesiasticism, it as undoubtedly tightened the chains of autocratic theology that bound individuals. The total effect of Puritanism on individual and human emancipation is of doubtful worth.

American Religion as I See It Lived, by Burris Jenkins. Bobbs Merrill.

A chatty record of the observations of a widely known and traveled Mid-Western modernist preacher. The author regards the church as a necessary nuisance, favors fishing on Sunday, and optimistically foresees a great religious awakening in the middle of which he sees Jesus marching in a blazing light.

The Origins of Synagogue and Church, by Dr. Kaufmann Kohler. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Before his death some four years ago, Dr. Kohler had long been one of the outstanding leaders of Reformed Judaism in America. Quiet, scholarly, courageous, he was more of a builder than a prophet. In this work he shows that the origin of the synagogue was in the work of saintly men who rebelled against the more formal practice of the temples. He sketches the connection between the early church and the synagogue. Skilfully and authoritatively he examines the liturgy and literature of both synagogue and church.

The Present and Future of Religion, by C. E. M. Joad. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Mr. Joad shows the drift from the church and the disintegration of ecclesiastical institutions, due to the impact of science and the spirit of the age. The result of this disintegration is a widespread belief that life is not worth living. Then follows a summary and devastating criticism of conventional Christian thought. Religious creeds are at best only working hypotheses. A creed in harmony with the thought of today or based on the discoveries of modern science is even more dangerous than the Athanasian creed. Such a creed will be out of harmony with the life of tomorrow. The religion of the future will address itself, first, to the need of the time. The author does not state just how we can know the needs of the time, if not on the basis of modern scientific information. And second, the religion of the future will "concern itself with man's relation to the universe as a whole." The author does not say how man can intelligently concern himself with the universe as a whole, unless it be on such information as modern science reveals. It is to be expected that the religious attitude which appears to sever itself from discoveries of science would eventuate in a blur. Such is the case, as witness the following:

> All that we are entitled to say is that deeper than the complex of feelings which has gone to the making of religion, the humility and reverence, the sense of obligation to mankind, the feeling of imperativeness and acting under orders which has traditionally been interpreted as divine inspiration, lies the sense of a mystery half revealed, of a hidden beauty and glory, of a transfiguring vision in which common things lose their solid importance, and become a thin veil behind which the ultimate reality of the universe is dimly seen.

The Coming Religion, by Nathaniel Schmidt. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Into the current discussion of changing conceptions of religion comes Nathaniel Schmidt who speaks in clear language and out of a rich background of scholarship. He goes immediately to the bottom of the matter and inquires what is the substance of religion.

> It cannot be monotheism, for some religions are polytheistic. It cannot be theism, for some religions are atheistic. Not only are there primitive religions that have not yet developed a god-conception, but *there are advanced religions that have abandoned it.* Buddhism and Jainism do not admit the existence of a deity; and of the six leading systems of religious thought in classical Brahmanism only two, Yoga and Advaita, or Vedanta, consistently proclaim a belief in Isvara or a godhead, while four, Sankhya, Nyaya, and Vaiseshika in their original form, and Mimamsa, reject it. Religion expresses itself, sometimes in polytheism, sometimes in monotheism, sometimes in pantheism, sometimes in atheism. It may exist without any definite belief concerning the nature of ultimate reality.

Various famous definitions of religion are considered and laid aside. There is the one by Cardinal Newman, "By religion," said he, "I mean the knowledge of God, of His will, and of our duties towards Him." Max Muller defined religion as "a mental faculty which independent of, nay, in spite of sense and reason, enables man to apprehend the infinite under different names and under varying disguises." Sabatier's definition was "Religion is a commerce, a conscious and willed relation into which the soul in distress enters with the mysterious power on which it feels that it and its destiny depend." Professor Schmidt then defends the thesis that "Religion is devotion to the highest." He says, "Religious devotion is the direction of the mind toward what is conceived to be the highest truth, of the will toward the highest duty, the chief thing to be done, and of the heart toward the highest beauty, the most complete harmony and satisfaction." This view makes religion "an integral element, in the achievements of science, philosophy, art, commerce, industry, citizenship, home-building, love, and friendship."

Always and everywhere religion is that which manifests itself in devotion to what is regarded as the highest.

CURTIS W. REESE.

The school board of the Borough of Wigan, England, has banned all studies relating to the army, navy, or air force, "to create a peace mentality among school children and to accelerate the establishment of international peace."

Science may have found a cure for most evils; but it has found no remedy for the worst of them all—the apathy of human beings.

—*Selected.*

Correspondence

Steps Toward Employment Stability

Editor of UNITY:

Economists are well agreed that the industrial depression is due in part to falling prices, and in part to the unequal distribution of purchasing power. The latter is especially true of this country. While our total national income has grown amazingly in recent years, the percentage of it received by persons with incomes of less than $5,000 has been decreasing, and is less now than in 1913. But during the period 1921-1926 the number of persons receiving incomes of more than $150,000 increased five-fold.

Here is a basic cause of depression. The small class (13 percent of the population) who now own 90 percent of the wealth of the country could not increase their consumption of goods greatly if they tried. If this congested wealth were more equitably distributed, so that the millions of families now on the ragged edge could buy the necessities, there would arise a demand for foodstuffs, clothing, furniture, houses, and other equipment that would quickly set industry on its feet.

The question is: Can such a result be achieved by means which the moral conscience of the country will approve? Let us briefly examine four proposals, none of which is very new or very radical.

(1) Insurance against unemployment. In the form in which this is being advocated at present—to have the government, the employer and the worker share the cost—it would be difficult to establish and maintain, because of the shifting that necessarily accompanies progress in industry. Machinery is constantly taking the place of men, and it is hardly feasible to hold the employer liable for a minimum wage to men whom he can no longer employ. It seems clear that the government must assume the employer's share of the burden and raise the necessary funds from taxes on incomes and inheritances. Quite largely these funds will come from the same sources as when the employer is included, but without interfering with progress. Safeguards against abuses in the administration of the insurance system have been already well worked out in England and Germany

(2) Old-age pensions. These must also be a care of the government. While certain corporations now have pension systems, there is reason to believe some of them seize any excuse to get rid of employes at middle age. Even assuming good faith in the handling of the corporation systems, there would remain large numbers of citizens without security for old age. Government old-age pensions alone will meet the need, and the cost here also should be levied mainly on large incomes and inheritances. It is neither good ethics nor good business in the long run to leave the burden of the relief of the jobless and the helpless aged to precarious private systems and chance charity. In general these classes are the victims of a ruthless economic system, and the congested wealth which this system has produced should be levied on, in order that the burden may be distributed more equitably than it could be under corporation pension systems and private charity.

(3) The government should stand ready to engage in industry wherever monopoly threatens, as now in the light and power industry. Domestic users of electric current in most of our states are now paying to private power companies about three times what the government-owned plants of Ontario are charging. Efforts at commission regulation have proved unsatisfactory, partly because of the complicated problem of arriving at a fair valuation on which to base rates, and also because of the control of many plants by holding companies located outside the jurisdicton of state commissions. There is still another and more important reason:

When you attempt regulation you attack the utility corporation at its most sensitive point, while it retains all its sinews of war, the best brains of the community and the strongest of motives to fight you. The contest frequently becomes a sort of guerrilla warfare, with the odds on the side of the most astute leaders. How often they resort to questionable methods we know too well. The power which the lure of monopoly profits has to warp the finer instincts of our ablest men is a more serious thing than the high rates we pay.

Government plants have proved to be the one simple and effective means of regulation. By establishing power plants at Muscle Shoals and on the St. Lawrence and in Montana, as has been proposed, and in other sections if necessary, we can give fair rates on electric current that will compel the private companies to do the same. In California this has already been accomplished through the building of a number of municipal power plants.

(4) Tariff reform. Among economists the generally accepted theory of taxation is that taxes should be levied according to ability to pay. But under the tariff system government revenue is collected from rich and poor without discrimination through increased prices on what they buy. Thus the poor carry more of the burden than the theory of equitable taxation allows. Not only this, but the tariff gives a virtual monopoly to favored interests, enabling these to enrich themselves at the expense of consumers.

Deplorable as is the present depression, we shall have one thing to be thankful for if it forever cures our people of the notion that high tariffs are the sure road to prosperity. Indeed, every consideration of good national policy, as well as of social welfare calls for a scaling down of tariffs. Yet it must be done with a degree of care; for industry could not accommodate itself overnight to a low-tariff basis.

There are sound reasons why each of the reforms here outlined will work toward a more equitable distribution of wealth. And by increasing the purchasing power of the masses they will bring greater stability in industry and employment. What is equally important, these reforms are fairly within reach: they already are supported by a large part of our people.

F. S. KINDER

Denver, Colo.

Temperance Seals

Editor of UNITY:

You will be glad to know that at last an inexpensive means has been devised to bring before the public eye the evil effects of beverage alcohol regardless of where or in what country it is sold.

The Educational Temperance Shields are seals printed in two sizes in patriotic colors and are intended for continual use by all Temperance Organizations and every individual who is interested in helping to create a change of thought by keeping this message in constant circulation and praying that its influence may never die.

These Shields are now being used by churches, Sunday schools, Missionary societies, Boards of Religious Education and Christian citizenship committees on correspondence and literature in every conceivable manner, to do the most valuable service to the human race.

Could you publish this letter in order that persons interested in circulating this "Silent Messenger" may know that they may be secured at $1.00 per 1,000 in each size. Larger quantities at a lower rate from

MARY LEWIS REED

150 Fifth Ave., New York City.

A Cheer!

Editor of UNITY:

A cheer for you! Your editorials are in no way excelled by any others, in fact UNITY is uniformly filled with excellent matter.

W. P. CALKINS

Montebello, California

Fireweed

Flags of fog in California,
Fireweed with spikes of flame,
Fireweed in dear New England,
East and West are just the same,
Loveliness is universal,
Laughing at each boundary line
But only those who see and claim it
Know the heart of the Divine.

HARRY ELMORE HURD

(*Continued from Page* 274)

forebears. But it hasn't improved fast enough to outstrip the retribution. And underlying all is the fact that the British have ignored until too late the axiom that "the best advertisement is a *satisfied* customer;" the fact that the corner-stone of prosperity is *good-will*. And that applies as well to a nation or to the world as a whole as to a peanut-stand. Great Britain has been very, very clumsy in her dealings with India; just as she was with that vast treasurehouse, once her fabulous opportunity for good-will, but now known as the United States of America. It is a way with these things: like chickens, they come home to roost

It may well be, as Wellington is supposed to have said, that on the playing-fields of Eton and Harrow Englishmen learn to win battles; but they do not learn there how to win and keep the affection of their subject peoples — the customers indispensable to their prosperity. I personally suspect that precisely what is taught—together with the way and atmosphere of the teaching—at those famous schools and their like, and at Cambridge and Oxford too, is largely responsible for the supercilious attitude of Englishmen toward other folk, as well as for their stolid resistance to anything "new." Characteristic are the mingled hooting and haughty scorn greeting Sir Oswald Mosley's proposal of an economic super-committee. I venture no opinion as to the merits of this particular suggestion or the capacity of its maker; but I catch a dominant note in the chorus—forsooth, he's young, and "radical." There's the chief rub; the war butchered the best of Great Britain's youth, who otherwise would now be ruling, and might even be finding a way out of the Slough of Despond.

"What cities, as great as this," Goldsmith asked, "have promised themselves immortality!"

By no means Great Britain alone. . . . There is no problem of human interchange or relationship, including that of the mess in which just now the whole world flounders, that could not; or, I dare to say that will not, be solved by the exercise on a large scale of that same ordinary common-sense, mutual patience and good will with which on a small scale, men are learning, to operate, and *co*-operate. But there must be enlisted on all hands the wisdom and the courage to sacrifice, to write off the uncollectible, to scrap the outworn and superannuated in method, material and personnel; to reorganize. Otherwise—the goblins *will* git us! This is the real test of "civilization." Must we wait for world starvation to compel us to use the world's brains?

—*John Palmer Gavit, in The Survey.*

William H. Taft on American Prohibition

In the following letter, written to a personal friend, the late William Howard Taft, then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and formerly President of the United States, set forth his opinion on the subject of National Prohibition in America.

This letter was presented to the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the National House of Representatives, in the course of the hearings on National Prohibition, by the recipient, Prof. Irving Fisher, of Yale University.

Supreme Court of the United States

Washington, D. C.
November 21, 1928

My Dear Irving:

Thank you for sending me your new book. I shall read it with a great deal of pleasure.

In the late campaign I found myself in a very awkward situation. I could not issue any publication during it, because of my being on the Bench, and yet the New York *World* published my anti-prohibition letters written to Lincoln (a dry of New Haven) before the adoption of the Amendment, and then nobody seemed to take the trouble to publish my speech at Yale given after the Amendment was adopted. But the result is glorious and points the only way that we have to work out the problem presented. The solution requires a great deal of time and patience. The habits of an important section of a congested part of the country can not be changed over night or in years. The reform and the adaptation of society to that at which the Amendment aims must be gradual. The temptation of corruption will drag it out. While looking ahead at the Amendment I despaired of any success, I really think it is possible, if we keep at it, to achieve a satisfactory result. The persistence with which the people maintain in Congress a two-thirds majority in both Houses gives me much hope, and I am inclined to think that this will wear down the moderate wets to a consciousness that the only solution is pressure in favor of enforcement.

I see that the wets claim that the election was not a prohibition victory. Well, one can not argue with that view, and can only let those who believe it continue to believe it.

As ever yours,
(Signed) William H. Taft.

Professor Irving Fisher,
Yale University,
New Haven, Conn.

HERESY: Bishop Brown's Quarterly Lectures for 1930, now complete. Subjects: **I The American Race Problem; II The Pope's Crusade Against the Soviet Union; III The Science of Moscow and the Superstition of Rome; IV The Godly Bishops and the Godless Bolsheviks. 10 cents per copy and 25 cents for a full set. Free to radical organizations for sale at meetings and to unemployed workers.**

THE BRADFORD-BROWN EDUCATIONAL CO.
GALION, OHIO

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE AT JOHNSON'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

CONSEQUENCES By JULIA ELLSWORTH FORD
Introduction by John Haynes Holmes

Nathaniel Peffer, author of China: The Collapse of a Civilization, says: Julia Ellsworth Ford makes in "Consequences" a powerful statement of the case of the Eastern peoples against Western greed and exploitation. She makes a powerful statement of the bitter truth of the opium evil, originally foisted on China by the white man for money profit. If the novel form will lead to a wider reading and appreciation of these truths, Mrs. Ford will have done a great service.

Special prices to libraries, schools, anti-narcotic societies and clubs.
Apply to Author, Rye, N. Y., E. P. Dutton and all bookshops. $1.50.

Be Yourself
A Periodical for Precarious Times
The Glass Hive—An American Group Book
(*ten times the year $2 c20 ea 4th yr*)
Edited by Will Levington Comfort, Box 33 So. Pasadena, California